DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 919 CG 012 854

AUTHOR Millet, June E.; Feuerhahn, Susan
TITLE What's in a Name?
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Psychological Association (58th, San Francisco, California, April 19-22, 1978); Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Androgyny; *Changing Attitudes; Occupations; Personality; Questionnaires; Research Projects; *Role Perception; *Sex Differences; *Sex Role; *Social Psychology; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Bem Sex Role Inventory

ABSTRACT

The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) was administered to 300 undergraduate college students over a three year period. Results indicated a consistent trend toward scores that were more "androgynous" for the male subjects and more "feminine" for the female subjects. These findings were questioned with respect to the social impact of the adjectives used in the BSRI. Separate questionnaires were developed to present scenarios concerning occupational roles that were typically stereotyped as male or female. One incorporated BSRI adjectives into the work role vignettes, and the other was identical except that the BSRI adjectives were excluded. A single questionnaire form was presented to 200 undergraduate college students who were matched with original subject population. Results indicated that those vignettes using BSRI "masculine" adjectives to describe males involved in stereotyped female work roles were rated "inappropriate" by the respondents. On the other hand, the vignettes using "masculine" adjectives to describe females in traditional male work roles were rated "appropriate." Findings were integrated into the contemporary social view of the occupational roles that are now open to females but which have long been stereotyped as "masculine." (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED160919

June E. Millet, Ph. D.
UCLA

Susan Feuerhahn
CSUN

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What's In A Name?

WPA Convention

San Francisco

April 1978

HARD COPY NOT AVAILABLE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Millet

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CG012854

June E. Millet, Ph. D.
UCLA
Susan Feuerhahn
CSUN
WPA Convention, 1978

What's In A Name?

Several years ago, on the occasion of the first presentation of my dissertation topic to a WPA Convention, a male academic, who I appreciate along with several other nurturant males both academics and non-academics, encouraged me to share with the audience the history of my research. He suggested that it may be that people are interested in where and how ideas for psychological research evolve and the course they follow to become operational. I felt that I could not, and therefore I did not begin that presentation with such a report. Today I know that I want to and so I will.

Three years ago I adopted the practice of using the Bem Scale as a teaching aid in conjunction with my lectures on sex role stereotyping to my lower division psychology classes. The concept of androgyny was promoted by Bem in her development of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). She established a list of 60 personality characteristics, 20 of which were classified as traditionally masculine (aggressive, dominant, forceful); 20 traditionally feminine characteristics (gentle, sensitive, shy); and 20 neutral (truthful, friendly, likable). These characteristics are listed in random order in the Inventory and the S indicates on a scale of one (never or almost never true) to seven (always or almost always true)

how accurate each word is as a self-description. The difference between the total points assigned to masculine and feminine adjectives indicates the degree of a person's sex-typing. If masculinity and femininity scores are approximately equal, the individual is typed as androgynous. The concept of Androgyny was received with great enthusiasm by my students - an idea whose time had come - or - so it seemed. On one occasion, following our practice of computing the BSRI scores for the class and comparing these to the normative data (Bem, 1974) and to the data collected in other classes one female student approached me after the lecture had ended and emphatically stated her intention to name her first-born child "Andry". Moreover, she hoped that this would be a male child so that he would, from conception, become an enlightened capable individual better able to function effectively in a wider variety of situations than the sex-typed person.

How elated I felt! How wonderful to have one's students take this theoretical knowledge and internalize it right before my eyes! I was inspired to continue this practice for at least one more year.

It was at the end of last year that I found the file drawer in my study dangerously bulging with BSRI test scores - a collection of 400+ sheets of paper and accompanying analyses. Before I threw out the data collection during the early years I was compelled to see where we had been, where we are now and perhaps wonder a bit about where we were going. After all, I owed this to Andry.

This was done. What we found was that the males were achieving consistently higher scores in the Androgynous range whereas the females were exhibiting a systematic decrease in their androgyny scores. Moreover, there appeared to be an accompanying increase in the Masculinity scores for both the males and the females coupled with a systematic decrease in Femininity scores for the males over this three year period. Female Ss, on the other hand, displayed a small increase in Femininity scores in 1976-77 followed by a substantial drop in these scores in 1977-1978.

(Insert Table 1)

Did this mean that "Women's Lib", the ERA movement, etc. had freed the men and further enslaved the women? We began our search for some answers.

One hypothesis we generated was that the 20 masculine adjectives included by Bem in her scale may have seemed desirable in American society to Stanford undergraduates in 1973-74 but were not reflecting an accurate picture of their desirability in American society in 1977-78. We recognized the general concern of college age males and females with the "humanistic" movements that have proliferated over the past five years in American society. College students, in particular, are notable in their quest for idealism in human affairs. What self-respecting male undergraduate in the post-Vietnam era would or will now admit to fitting the "macho" or "jock" image? There appears to be support for this contention in the study by Nicoll & Bryson

(1977) in their findings that the BSRI provides a more accurate description of the feminine stereotype. We agree that further investigation of the BSRI is needed to determine general social desirability of the masculine and feminine personality characteristics as well as their specific desirability for both males and females.

Our second hypothesis focused on the psychological liberation of women. We recognized that over the last 5 years in American society an increasing number of women were considering entry into occupations and careers that were traditionally regarded as "male" (Mattice, Friedlander, & Pace, 1978).

I have been personally involved in this aspect of our study. In 1974 I had the responsibility of directing and chairing the search committee for the selection of the first Director of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics at UCLA. During the year of the work of the Search Committee I often wondered about the lack of role models for the female candidates for the position. We all know how the male athletic directors in American society looked, acted, and sounded. What professional/personality characteristics would their newly appointed female counterparts adopt? Would they emulate the only available role models' attitudes and behaviors or would they develop their unique style(s)?

We expanded our speculations to women who were adopting career patterns of Navy Jet Pilots, West Point Plebes, middle-managers in commerce and industry, etc. If our preliminary data derived from the stack of BSRI

forms was generalizable to the larger population in American society then females entering non-traditional, or male, occupations, could retain their essential femininity and have an easier time of it than anyone suspected. On the other hand, if the increasing number of male Androgyny scores were a result of the contemporary social undesirability of describing one-self as aggressive, dominant, or forceful if one is male, then females were not to enjoy the exhilarating effects of equal opportunity. We opted for the latter speculation. Social comparison theory and the dearth of successful females in male occupational roles prompted us to hypothesize that females who enter non-female jobs will adopt male behavioral and attitudinal characteristics in occupational settings.

Numerous and diverse studies have been reported in the literature that focus on sex-typed appropriateness of occupations. Feather (1975) and Feather & Simon (1975) address the issue of male/female reaction to success and failure. Maccoby (1963); Horner (1972) have emphasized the non-correspondence between those personality characteristics that have been traditionally associated with the role of wife/mother and those that have been associated with the role of achiever in the occupational and professional worlds. Darley (1976) comments on the role conflict that results from the females' attempt to combine both roles. She points out that aside from practical considerations, the lack of clear-cut norms for such a combination of roles exacerbates an already tenuous situation. These are, indeed, persons who are

caught between two distinct reference groups. In this paper we will present additional evidence to support Darley's conclusions based on the Jones & Davis (1965) inference theory of attribution process.

However, to be female, unmarried and without children presents a problem to the woman who is attempting to succeed in a traditionally male occupation to make social comparisons where the number of referents, or, relevant others is so sparse. Is the main reason for the paucity of relevant others their FOS (Horner, 1968)? Condry & Dyer (1976) argue against this suggestion. Perhaps some explanation may be found in studies similar to the one reported by Baird (1977). Baird's paper is similar to others that relate the choice of an occupation to expectations for success or failure to the sex of the person. It describes the different images held by male and female college seniors with respect to 5 careers: medicine, law, college teaching and research, elementary/secondary teaching, and business. He suggests that expectations for success or failure depend not so much on the preparation one engages in for succeeding in a field of endeavor as the perceptions one holds of that career field.

Females reported more appealing and challenging attributes in elementary/secondary school teaching than the males. The male subjects (12,315) indicated more favorable images of college teaching, law, and medicine. These last two career fields were reported to be rated lower by females because of the time required to be spent away from

one's family.

Baird describes the women in his national sample (8,333) retaining a belief in traditional ideas and thus may not pursue some careers because of their beliefs. Similar to Darley's analysis, Baird states that while women may find some careers as attractive as men do they may also feel that these "male" careers conflict with the dual roles they anticipate.

Baird recommends certain activities to protect both sexes from being victimized by their own ideas about careers. He specifically suggests that ". . . more examples of women who are successful professionals, in a variety of challenging careers, need to be made available to college women."

We agree with this intervention - but - when it is followed by the statement "Perhaps a program of coffee hours and discussion groups would be helpful" we wondered about who would make and serve the coffee?

We set out to investigate the social impact of the BSRI adjectives since our 1975-77 data indicated a consistent trend toward scores that were more androgynous for the male Ss and more masculine for the female subjects. Our second task was concerned with the perceptions that both males and females held of themselves in cross-sexed occupational role settings.

Method

Subjects

There were 200 Ss (100 male, 100 female) enrolled in introductory courses in psychology and sociology at two community colleges in the Los Angeles area. Fifty of the males and fifty females were given Form I of the questionnaire (scenarios with BSRI adjectives); an equal number of males and females were given Form II (scenarios without BSRI adjectives). The Ss were matched for age, sex, SES, and years of education to the original (1973-1977) subject population.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was constructed in order to present scenarios concerning occupational roles that are typically stereotyped as male or female. There were an equal number of male and female job situations depicted in the instrument. Male occupations included: telephone line maintenance, bank manager, detective, electronics student, plumber. Female occupations included: nursery school teacher, homemaker, nurse, secretary, cosmetic sales

Each "male" job situation was to be rated with respect to the Appropriateness or Inappropriateness of a female worker in that job, and each "female" job situation considered similar ratings for a male worker.

Two questionnaire forms were developed: Form I incorporates BSRI

adjectives into the work-role vignettes and Form II is identical to Form I except that the BSRI adjectives are excluded.

Results

Preliminary analysis of the data were performed to assess the affect of the BSRI sex-linked adjectives on the Appropriateness/Inappropriateness ratings of the male vs. female respondents. Table 2 shows the overall ratings of the 200 Ss expressed in percent Appropriateness. It is divided into ratings received in response to Questionnaire Forms I & II, with BSRI adjectives and without these adjectives.

(Insert Table 2)

In general the major hypotheses of the study were confirmed. The percentage ratings of Appropriateness for those Ss who completed Form II (no BSRI adjectives) were fairly similar. Female respondents tended to rate cross-sexed stimulus person x occupation slightly higher than male respondents: female in male role = 90% Appropriate (males rated this combination 84% Appropriate); male in female role = 86% Appropriate (males rated this combination 80% Appropriate).

Table 3 presents the results of a one tailed t test performed to test the affect of the vignettes with the BSRI adjectives absent on male vs. female S ratings of Inappropriateness. The results were not significant below the .50 level.

(Insert Table 3 here)

That the addition of the BSRI adjectives polarizes the perceptions and consequently the responses of the Ss is shown in both Table 2 and later on in Table 4. Female and male respondents indicated greater acceptance of female stimulus persons who enter into male occupational roles and who are described by masculine BSRI adjectives [Appropriateness rating = 97% (F) and 94% (M)] than they were of female stimulus persons in male occupational roles who were described by female BSRI adjectives [Appropriateness rating 84% (F) and 84% (M)].

However, in rating a male stimulus person, entering a female role and described by a male adjective, the Appropriateness rating is dramatically depressed particularly by F respondents [Appropriateness rating = 62% (F) and 74% (M)]. A male in a female role described by female adjectives received a 98% Appropriateness rating from F respondents and a 94% rating by M respondents.

It is interesting to note here that given the aspect of social undesirability connected with the masculine BSRI adjectives the male Ss were more accepting of a M stimulus person who enters a female role and retains his masculine personality characteristics. Masculine appropriateness ratings in this case were 74%; a 12% increase over the female appropriateness ratings for this condition.

(Insert Table 4 here)

There was a significant difference ($p < .001$) between the Inappropriateness ratings assigned to males in female occupations on Form I (with the BSRI adjectives) compared to the results from respondents who were assigned Form II (without BSRI adjectives). Similarly, with t significant at the .05 level females in a male occupation were rated more inappropriate when the BSRI adjectives were used than when they were deleted. However, in this case the difference was considerably less significant. Table represents the differences that were obtained when means of the Inappropriateness ratings of females in male occupations were compared on the basis of their BSRI masculine vs. feminine descriptions when rated by female and male respondents. Clearly in this case the female respondent opts for the masculine descriptors. Male respondent ratings followed a similar pattern but the males were slightly less tolerant than the females where male adjectives were used to describe females in male roles. The males were also found to give higher inappropriateness ratings than the females when female adjectives were employed. However, both sex groups indicated that male adjectives used to describe females who enter male job roles increased the appropriateness of the situation ($p < .05$).

In the case of males in female occupations compared on the basis of their BSRI adjectival descriptions, male respondents compared to

females were much more tolerant of males who are described as masculine who enter female occupations. On the other hand, they were slightly less accepting than the female respondents of males in this case who are described with female BSRI adjectives ($p < .001$). Table 6 presents this data.

(Insert Tables 5 & 6 here)

Discussion

Our first hypothesis, questioning the social desirability of the BSRI masculine and feminine personality characteristics in contemporary American society is confirmed by the differences obtained in ratings of appropriateness in the experimental situations that vary sex of the stimulus person with sex of the occupational role. With the BSRI adjectives included in the questionnaire vignettes the appropriatness ratings by both sexes ranged from 62% to 98% for female respondents and from 74% to 94% for male respondents. Thus, there is a difference of 36% in the ratings for female respondents and 20% for the males. Without the BSRI adjectives, using identical scenarios, the ratings by both sexes differed by only 4% for the male and female respondents respectively.

When the adjectives and the stimulus persons were both masculine the ratings of appropriateness reached their lowest points [62% (F),

74% (M)]. It appears that our speculations concerning the declining social desirability of the masculine BSRI adjectives, in the case of the male stimulus person, are not without substance. Further investigation should be under taken in order to ascertain the attitudes of respondents to males in typically male occupational roles who are described by both sexed adjectives. Moreo[illegible] the judgements of appropriateness should be made by Ss drawn [illegible]rious SES, age, ethnic and educational groups in the gener[illegible]l po[illegible]ulation. The college sophmore as S should be given a well-deser[illegible]rest so that we may generalize with greater confidence to the total popul[illegible]tion.

Our second hypothesis, that females who enter non-female jobs will tend to adopt masculine behavioral and attitudinal characteristics in occupational settings is supported by our experimental results. Both male and female respondents gave significantly higher appropriateness ratings to females who enter male occupational roles and are described as masculine compared to their descriptions as feminine in a masculine role. Both groups also gave high appropriateness ratings to males who enter female jobs and are described by feminine BSRI adjectives.

There is a notable difference between the ratings of males and females on this measure which provides meaningful implications to our research. In comparison with the other experimental conditions, male and female Ss rated male stimulus persons entering female occupations

who are described with masculine BSRI adjectives lowest with respect to the measure of appropriateness. However, the male respondents rated this conditional combination 12% more appropriate than the female respondents. It appears, then, that the males are reflecting more of the theoretical aspects of Androgyny than their female counterparts. They are somewhat accepting of males who display feminine personality characteristics in female roles; at the same time they are more tolerant than female respondents of males who are described by masculine personality characteristics in female occupational situations.

Could it be that females, who have been exquisitely socialized to conform to normative social roles, are again displaying their need for social approval and will attempt to enter male occupations by acting more and more like the male role models that have existed in these settings for so long? It seems from this study that this is a distinct possibility. However, there should be further work done to survey the attitudes toward masculine and feminine personality characteristics of females who have already achieved success in traditionally male occupations and of males who have been successful in traditionally female occupations.

We clearly need additional and substantive information concerning the attitudes and behavior of men and women today who contemplate occupational roles that are now open to females and males and

which have so long been stereotyped as "masculine" and "feminine". Perhaps we ought not to concentrate exclusively on the socialization of ANDRY but turn our attention to the ANDREAS.

TABLE 1

PERCENT CHANGE IN BSRI SCORES: 1973-1978

	Androgyny		Femininity		Masculinity	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
5-76	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-77	+14%	-7%	-28%	+5%	+14%	+1%
7-78	+20%	-4%	-16%	-28%	+10%	+30%
	+34%	-11%	-44%	-23%	+24%	+31%

FORM I

Percent Rated Appropriate with Adjectives

Respondents	Stimulus Person	Adjective	Role	Appropriate
Female	Male	Female	Female	98%
Female	Female	Male	Male	97%
Female	Female	Female	Male	84%
Female	Male	Male	Female	62%
Male	Male	Female	Female	94%
Male	Female	Male	Male	94%
Male	Female	Female	Male	84%
Male	Male	Male	Female	74%

FORM II

Percent Rated Appropriate without Adjectives

Respondent	Stimulus Person	Role	Appropriate
Female	Male	Female	86%
Female	Female	Male	90%
Male	Male	Female	80%
Male	Female	Male	84%

Table 2

TABLE 3

Sex of Respondent's Inappropriateness Rating of Stimulus Person in Cross-Sex Role. No Adjective.

	Male in Female Role	Female in Male Role
Female Respondent	6.4	5.20
Male Respondent	9.8	8.00
t	1.48	1.12

TABLE 4

Mean Inappropriateness Rating of Cross-Sexed Stimulus Person and Occupation

	Male in Female Occupation	Female in Male Occupation
Adjective	18.8	10.3
No Adjective	8.1	6.6
t	5.8*	1.88**

* $P < .001$

** $P < .05$

TABLE 5

Inappropriateness Rating of Female in Male Occupation

Female vs. Masculine Adjective

	Female Respondent	Male Respondent
Masculine Adjective	1.6	3.0
Female Adjective	5.8	8.2
t	2.28*	2.89*

* $P < .05$

TABLE 6

Inappropriateness Rating of Male in Female Occupation

Female vs. Masculine Adjectives

	Female Respondent	Male Respondent
Masculine Adjective	18.8	15.0
Female Adjective	1.0	2.8
t	14.8*	6.39*

* $P < .001$

References

Angrist, Shirley S., & Almquist, Elizabeth M. Careers & contingencies. New York: Dunellen, 1975.

Baird, Leonard L. Men & women college seniors' images of five careers. APA Convention, San Francisco, August 1977.

Bem, Sandra L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42(2), 155-162.

Bem, Sandra L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1975, 31(4), 634-643.

Bem, Sandra L. and Lenney, Ellen. Sex typing and the avoidance of cross sex behavior. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1976, 33(1), 48-54.

Bem, Sandra L. et al. Sex typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1976, 34(5), 1016-1023.

Bem, Sandra L. On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45(2), 196-205.

Brehony, Kathleen et al. Psychological androgyny and social conformity. APA Convention, San Francisco, August 1977.

Condry, J. & D. Sharon. Fear of success: Attribution of cause to the victim. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 63-83.

Darley, S.A. Big-time careers for the little woman: A dual-role dilemma. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32(3).

Feather, N.T. Positive and negative reactions to male and female success and failure in relation to the perceived status and sex-typed appropriateness of occupations. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1975, 31(5), 536-545.

Feather, N.T. & Simon, J.G. Reaction to male and female success and failure in sex-linked occupations. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1975, 31(1), 20-31.

Frieze, Irene H. et al. Women & sex roles. New York: Norton, 1978.

Horner, M.S. Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance in competitive and non-competitive situations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968. (University Microfilms No. 69-12, 135).

Horner, M.J. Achievement-related conflicts in women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28(2), 157-175.

Jones, E.E. & Davis, K.E. From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 2). New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Maccoby, E. Women's intellect. In S.M. Farber & R.H.L. Wilson (Eds.), The potential of women. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Mattice, N., Friedlander, J. & C.R. Pace. Characteristics of UCLA freshmen. Publication of LAB for Research on Higher Education. Graduate School of Education, UCLA. 1978

Nicoll, Teri & Bryson, Jeff. Intersex and intrasex stereotyping on the bem sex role inventory. APA Convention, San Francisco, August 1977.

Singer, June. Androgyny: Toward a new theory of sexuality. New York: Anchor Press, 1976.

Spence, Janet et al. Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relations to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1975, 32(1), 29-39.

Yorburg, Betty. Sexual identity: Sex roles & social change. New York: Wiley, 1974.